UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,271	02/17/2004	Philip C. Hodge	110308-0001	2235

39905   7590   08/14/2008
ROETZEL AND ANDRESS
222 SOUTH MAIN STREET
AKRON, OH 44308

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/780,271	HODGE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT STEVENS	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 May 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-16,18,19,22-30,32-34,36-41,43-45 and 47-56</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-16,18,19,22-30,32-34,36-41,43-45 and 47-56</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 May 2008</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
          application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Office withdraws the previous objections to the claims, specification and drawings,

and the previous rejections of claims 1, 3-16, 18-19, 22-26 and 32 under 35 USC §101, in light

of the amendment. However, the Office maintains the previous rejections of the claims 27-30

under 35 USC §101and the previous rejections of all of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in

light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC §101: Applicant has

amended independent claims 1 and 32 to recite a requirement for at least one hardware element.

Therefore claims 1 and 32, and their dependent claims, are statutory under 35 USC §101.

However, independent claim 27 (and dependent claims 28-30) have been interpreted as

encompassing a purely software embodiment (i.e., software per se), and therefore these claims

do not fall within a statutory subject matter category.

        On pages 14-15, Applicant describes Applicant's subject matter in detail.

        However, it is noted that such a detailed description is not reflected in the claim

language.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant argues on pages 15-16 that the references do not teach data management logic to automatically update a path of a link, because the cited passages in Ferguson because the STG file of Ferguson is not a link, but rather a file that contains many attributes that describe a corresponding electronic document. Second, Applicant appears to argue that Ferguson teaches away from link updating because, although Ferguson states that "an existing STG file may be updated if the corresponding document is modified", Ferguson goes on to state that there may be instances in which a link is eliminated.

The Office respectfully disagrees, noting that the references taken as a whole teach the recited claim language. It is further noted that a "link" is reasonably interpreted as an association or a relationship. See definition number 3a for "link" on page 806 of The American Heritage College Dictionary, 4th Edition, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, MA, (c) 2002. A copy of this definition has been provided with this Office Action. The STG file of Ferguson, therefore, has been reasonably interpreted as suggesting the recited link. It is also noted that Applicant's claim language does not reflect a requirement for any specific link type or link implementation (e.g., URL, pointer, namespace-based reference, etc.). In fact, Applicant has argued for a broad interpretation of "link" in the paragraph spanning pages 14 and 15 of the "Remarks" section, stating that "a link is not limited to HTML".

Second, Ferguson teaches updating of these links, as indicated in Applicant's arguments. The fact that Ferguson teaches that there may be reasons to discard a link is not germane to the claim language. (A reason to eliminate a link, for example, may be that the document has been

deleted.) Such issues are not addressed/reflected in the claim language. Therefore, the

references have been properly interpreted as teaching the claim language, as recited.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant argues on

page 16 that the references do not teach data management logic to automatically update a path of

a link, because the cited passage in Greffenstette does not mention the updating of link or

hyperlink paths.

The Office respectfully disagrees, noting that the references taken as a whole teach the

recited claim language. First, it is noted that a "link" is reasonably interpreted as an association

or a relationship. See definition number 3a for "link" on page 806 of The American Heritage

College Dictionary, 4th Edition, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, MA, (c) 2002. A copy of this

definition has been provided with this Office Action. The STG file of Ferguson, therefore, has

been reasonably interpreted as suggesting the recited link. It is also noted that Applicant's claim

language does not reflect a requirement for any specific link type or link implementation (e.g.,

URL, pointer, namespace-based reference, etc.). In fact, Applicant has argued for a broad

interpretation of "link" in the paragraph spanning pages 14 and 15 of the "Remarks" section,

stating that "a link is not limited to HTML".

Additionally, it is noted that the cited paragraph [0295] of Greffenstette discusses the use

of a window that "permits a user to ... update .. information" and that such "information may be

inserted as links". It is further noted that paragraph [0309] of Greffenstette also discusses the

association of an expanded (or updated) URL with a modified document. Therefore, the

references have been properly interpreted as teaching the claim language, as recited.

Applicant further argues on page 16 that all of the claims are allowable for the reasons

argued above.

The Office respectfully disagrees, and counter-asserts the rationale set forth above.

It is further noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be

limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that

it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d

1331, 1332-1333, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d

1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

The Office also notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ

342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take

into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled

in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Further MPEP 2123, states that "a

reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having

ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft

Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

        For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth

below.

Claim Objections

3.   **Claims 36-37 and 43 are objected to** because of the following informalities: Claims 36

and 37 recite dependence upon cancelled claim 35, and claim 43 recites dependence upon

cancelled claim 42. Appropriate correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(m).

        For the purpose of further examination, claims 36 and 37 will be considered to be

dependent upon independent claim 33, and claim 43 will be considered to be dependent upon

independent claim 40.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions
> and requirements of this title.

5.   **Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

        Independent claim 27 is directed to software per se (i.e., a software system). See the

specification at paragraph [0044] in context of paragraph [0046], which indicate that the

inventive subject matter may be a software "add-in" (i.e.., a plug-in to a software application).

Claim 27 encompasses a collection of software means.

        This claim encompasses a mere collection of software modules and thus each lacks the

necessary physical articles or objects (e.g., hardware elements) to constitute a machine or a

manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC §101. This claim is clearly not a series of steps or

acts to be a process nor is it a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of

matter. As such, this claim fails to fall within a statutory category.

        Claims 28-30 depend upon claim 27, and do not correct the deficiencies of that claim.

These claims are likewise rejected.

                        Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

        (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
        in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
        art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
        to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
        negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 1, 3-16, 18-19, 22-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-45 and 47-56 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent Application Publication No.

2003/0120729, filed as a continuation of Application no. 08/908544, which was filed on Aug. 7,

1997 and published on Jan. 26, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Kim") in view of Ferguson et al.

(US Patent No. 6,820,094, filed Oct. 8, 1997 and issued Nov. 16, 2004, hereafter referred to as

"Ferguson") and Grefenstette et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205448,

provisionally filed on Aug. 13, 2001 and published on Oct. 14, 2004, hereafter referred to as

"Grefenstette").

    Regarding independent claim 1: Kim discloses

A digital computer system, including a terminal and a data-management system for generating

a link in real time between an electronic document opened in a computer application and a

target document, said digital computer terminal comprising a computer readable memory and

a data-capture device, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing

automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser

application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said data-management*

system comprising: data-capture logic for controlling capture of electronic data by said data-

capture device; (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) *target-document logic*

for generating said target document from said electronic data; and (See paragraph [0012] in

Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) *link-generating*

logic for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable

memory and generating said link to said target document in said electronic document in real

time; (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage

and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently

required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) *data-management logic for transmitting*

said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device (See paragraphs

[0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *wherein said data management logic and said*

link editing logic automatically updates the path of said link to maintain functionality of said

link following said transmission Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3

lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column

7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to "the modification of its

corresponding document".)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with

an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate

and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were

all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and link-editing logic for updating a path of said link* Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 3: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of top-level directories and subfolders. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 3 and column 4 lines 59-67 in Ferguson, illustrating the use of top-level folder and subdirectories. The specific data one arranged in a hierarchy was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 4: Kim teaches the use of hard disk data storage. (See Figure 1 #3 in Kim, showing a file server computer, it having been well-known in the art that file server computers contain a hard drive.

   Regarding claim 5: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests

this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and

printing documents.)

   Regarding claims 7-12: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson,

though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11 in Ferguson, discussing the

processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a

plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1,

1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art

at the time of the invention.)

   Regarding claim 13: Kim does not explicitly teach link removal. Ferguson, though,

suggests this limitation. (See column 7 lines 53-57 in Ferguson, discussing the removal of only

the link.)

   Regarding claims 14-16 and 18-19: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited

limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests the use of an add-in. (See Figure 12 in Ferguson,

showing the display results for a browser application add-in.) Ferguson also suggests the use of

a data management system for text documents. (See the Abstract of Ferguson, discussing a

document management application program, it having been an obvious variant to one skilled in

the art at the time of the invention as to number of software modules and the location of specific

functionality in each module.) Ferguson also suggests link-editing/ updating. (See column 3

lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing the updating of an STG data storage file.) Ferguson teaches

the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to

represent hyperlinks.)

        Regarding claim 22: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests

this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and

printing documents.)

        Regarding claims 23-26: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations.

Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11, discussing the

processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a

plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1,

1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art

at the time of the invention.)

      Regarding independent claim 27: Kim discloses

      A data-management system for generating a plurality of links to target documents in an electronic document, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said data-management system comprising: means for creating and editing an electronic document; means for generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data captured by a data-capture device;* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *means for storing said plurality of captured target documents in a computer readable memory; and means for generating a link at a plurality of user-selected locations in said electronic document to said plurality of captured target documents.* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

      However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of

sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential

numbering of documents [e.g., D_1, D_2, etc.].)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with

an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate

and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were

all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *means for updating a path of said plurality*

of hyperlinks in a user selected range of said electronic document. Grefenstette, though,

suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of

links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do

so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is

accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the

same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 28: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests

this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and

printing documents.

Regarding claim 29: Kim teaches "transmitting" documents to storage. (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing storage of documents.) However, Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 32: Kim discloses

A computer system for linking a target document to a portion of an electronic document in real time (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing automatic link generation to a scanned document file), *said computer system comprising: a computer for generating and editing an electronic document;* (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing the use of a scanner and generation of an electronic file.) *link-generating logic operable with said computer application for generating a link to said target document, wherein said target document is an electronic reproduction of a hardcopy document and is to be generated by scanning said hardcopy document with an optical data-capture device, further wherein said link is to be generated at approximately the same time as said captured target document is to be saved, and further wherein said computer application is one of a group consisting of a spreadsheet, word*

processor, database, presentation application, and any combination thereof. (See the Abstract
and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Ferguson, discussing a browser application and automatic link
generation to an HTML page and storage, in context of [0005], discussing the scanning of paper
documents using an optical data-capture device such as a scanner. It is noted that paragraph
[0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which requires that the file be stored.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing. Ferguson, though, suggests editing.
(See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with
an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate
and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were
all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and link-editing logic for updating a path of*
said link; Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295]
discussing the dynamic updating of links.) *and the link is automatically updated* Grefenstette,
though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic
updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do
so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is

accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the

same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

   Regarding independent claim 33: Kim discloses

A data-management system for linking a portion of an electronic document to a target

document, (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing linking an input image) *said data-management*

system comprising: a data-capture device for capturing electronic data representing an

information object; (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) *means for*

generating said target document from said electronic data; (See paragraph [0012] in Kim,

discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) *a computer readable*

memory to store said target document; and (See paragraph [0014] in Kim, which discusses the

retrieval of the created image file, which required that the file be stored before being retrieved. It

is inherent that such data storage required a computer readable memory.) *means for*

substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable memory

and generating a link to said target document in said electronic document; (See paragraphs

[0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that

paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the

file be stored before being retrieved.) *means for transmitting said electronic document and*

said target document to a data storage device; (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim,

discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *wherein said transmitting means automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following transmission.* Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to "the modification of its corresponding document".)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and means for updating a path of said plurality of hyperlinks in a user-selected range of said electronic document;* Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 34: Kim teaches the use of a scanner. (See paragraph [0012] of Kim.)

Claims 36-37 are substantially similar to claims 3-4, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected. It is further noted that the exact "means" (e.g., hardware or software element) in which a particular functionality was implemented, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claims 38-39: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding independent claim 40: Kim discloses
An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a link to a target document in a computer application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said method comprising the steps of: generating a target document from electronic data representing an information object captured by a data-capture device; and* (See

paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *substantially simultaneously storing said target document in a computer readable memory and generating said link at said user-selected location in said electronic document.* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) **transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device upon receiving a command from a user;** (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *and updating a path of said link to render said link operable after said transmission*. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to "the modification of its corresponding document".)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach ***and updating the path of said link***
Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the
dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do
so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is
accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the
same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 41: Kim does not explicitly teach document viewing. Ferguson,
though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 1 element #169 and column 11 lines 28-32 in
Ferguson, discussing document viewing.

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 44: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests
this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and
printing documents.)

Claim 45 is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 47: Kim discloses

An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a plurality of links to target documents in a computer application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) *said method comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data representing one or more information objects captured by a data-capture device;* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *generating one or more links to the target documents in said electronic document.* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers.* Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.) Ferguson also suggests the

generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson,

discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word

documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a

compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use

of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the

sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D_1, D_2, etc.].)

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with

an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate

and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were

all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

     Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and updating the path of said link.*

Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the

dynamic updating of links.)

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do

so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is

accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the

same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Claims 48-49 are substantially similar to claim 42 and claim 3, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 50: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claim 51: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of icons. Ferguson teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to represent links.)

Regarding claim 52: Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Regarding claim 53: Kim does not explicitly teach user selected link locations, comparing the number of locations with the number of documents to be linked and generating a link for each document. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 9 lines 51-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the importing documents, and column 9 lines 27-31, discussing the linking of multiple documents.)

Claims 54-55 are substantially similar to claims 24-25, respectively, and therefore

likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 56: Kim discloses

A data-management system for generating a hyperlink in real time between a portion of an

electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document, (See the

Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a

target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a

target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to include more than one link.) *said system comprising: a digital computer terminal*

comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device; (See Figure 2 #88 and

#82 of Kim) *data-capture logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for*

controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device; (See The Kim Figure 2 #80,

81 and 82, in context of paragraph [0012] discussing the use of a scanner.) *target-document*

logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for generating said target

document from said electronic data; (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing generation of a target

document via a scanning process for display in a browser.) *link-generating logic in*

communication with said digital computer terminal for substantially simultaneously storing

said target document in said computer readable memory and generating said link to said

target document in said electronic document in real time; (See the Abstract and paragraphs

[0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML

document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital

format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include

more than one link.) *data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and*

said target document to a data storage device. (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim,

discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *wherein said data-management logic*

automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following said

transmission. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in

Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57,

discussing a scenario involving link generation due to "the modification of its corresponding

document".)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with

an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate

and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were

all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *link-editing logic for updating a path of said*

link; Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295]

discussing the dynamic updating of links.) *and said link updating logic for updating a path of*

said link automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link

following said transmission. Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette

paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do

so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is

accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the

same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Creech, Michael L., "Author-Oriented Link Management", Computer Networks and
ISDN Systems, Vol. 28, Issues 7-11, May 1996, pp. 1015-1025.
The American Heritage College Dictionary, 4th Edition, Houghton Mifflin Co.,
Boston, MA, (c) 2002, p. 806.

US Patent Application Publications

Freedman et al	2002/0083123

US Patents

Irons	6,192,165
Knowlton	6,181,838
Knowlton et al	5,973,692
Pogrebisky et al	5,958,008
Chang	5,694,594

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Stevens/
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

August 7, 2008

/John Breene/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162